

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/691,816	10/19/2000	Alan Rozich	PROGRA 3.0-006	5396	
530 7:	590 05/07/2003				
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG, KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK 600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST			EXAMINER		
			BARRY. CHESTER T		
WESTFIELD, NJ 07090			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1724		
			DATE MAILED: 05/07/2003	DATE MAILED: 05/07/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					140		
		Applicat	ion No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/691,8	316	ROZICH, ALAN			
		Examine	er	Art Unit			
		Chester		1724			
Period for		nication appears on th	he cover s	sheet with the correspondence address			
A SHO THE N - Exten after S - If the - If NO - Failur - Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN sions of time may be available under the provision SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this com	IICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no emunication. 30) days, a reply within the stratutory period will apply and the will be statutory be cause the all	event, howev atutory minin will expire Si	wer, may a reply be timely filed mum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	1.		
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) f	filed on <u>08 April 2003</u>	<u>}</u> .				
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL .	2b)⊠ This action					
3) Dispositi	Since this application is in condition closed in accordance with the praction of Claims	on for allowance exce ctice under <i>Ex part</i> e	ept for for Quayle,	rmal matters, prosecution as to the merits 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	is		
4)⊠	در Claim(s) 6 and 16 is/are pending	n the application.		·			
۰,/حع	4a) Of the above claim(s) 4,7-75 is/	are withdrawn from o	considera	ation.			
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	Claim(s) 6 and 16 is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restr	riction and/or election	requirer	ment.			
	ion Papers						
	The specification is objected to by t						
10)[The drawing(s) filed on is/are	e: a) accepted or b)	objecte	ed to by the Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any o	bjection to the drawing	(s) be held	Id in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11) 🔲				ed b) disapproved by the Examiner.			
	If approved, corrected drawings are		Office act	aton.			
•	The oath or declaration is objected	to by the Examiner.					
	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			- 11 - 2 - 2 - 14 - 2 - 14 - 2 - 14 - 14			
1	Acknowledgment is made of a clai		under 35	5 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (τ).			
a)	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of						
	1. Certified copies of the priori						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
*	 Copies of the certified copie application from the Intelligence the attached detailed Office act 	ernational Bureau (P0	CT Rule 1	ave been received in this National Stage 17.2(a)). opies not received.			
				35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional applica	tion).		
	a) The translation of the foreign lacknowledgment is made of a clair	language provisional	applicati	ion has been received.			
Attachme							
1) Noti	ice of References Cited (PTO-892) ice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449	v (PTO-948) b) Paper No(s)	4)		.· 		

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 09/691,816

Art Unit: 1724

Claims 16, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no support for the notion that not more than insubstantial amount of biological reaction takes place in the chemical treatment tank. The skilled artisan would have expected biological reaction of the unconverted organic compounds to have continued in the chemical treatment tank because: Applicant transfers unconverted organic compounds and viable albeit settled biosolids from the upstream reaction tank to the downstream tank and then adds an oxidation agent, e.g., oxygen. One would have expected additional biological reaction to have continued in this downstream chemical treatment tank. The mere fact that chemical (i.e., non-biological) reactions take place there does not necessarily mean biological reactions does not simultaneously take place there. See Tsumura for an example of this point. Further, there is nothing about claim 16 step (c) requirement that the ORP be greater than 0 mV (i.e., positive) that prohibits or prevents further not insubstantial biological reaction from taking place. In this regard, please see, for example, Fig 2 and col 3 lines 35-50 of USP 5582734 to Coleman for substantial evidence that a positive ORP and furtherance of not insubstantial amounts of biological reaction and not mutually exclusive concepts.

7033065921

CHESTER T. BARRY PRIMARY EXAMINER